

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Glover

Application No.: 10/807,698

Filed: 3/24/2004

FOR: IMPROVED WEB CRAWLING

Examiner: KIM, PAUL

Art Unit: 2161

RESPONSE

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The Office Action mailed October 30, 2006 rejected claims 1-5,7 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lakritz (US. Patent No. 6,526,426). Further, claims 6,8-9 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz, in view of Official Notice.

In light of the arguments below, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that the claims are in condition for allowance.

The Section 102 Rejection

As per independent claims 1 and 21, the Office Action asserted that Lakritz teaches:

A method for crawling for resources in a network, the method comprising:
receiving a list of resources on the network and for at least one of the resources on the list of resources,

sending a first request to a server in the network for the resource using a first browser state {See LAKRTIZ, C3:L61-67, wherein this reads over "the Visitor module . . . automatically determines the language and country of a Web site visitor and directs the Web server to deliver the appropriate localized content contained in one or more country/language databases and/or file-based content in a file system 204 to the visitor's browser"), and

sending a second request for the same resource using a second browser state (See LAKRTIZ, C3:L61-67, wherein this reads over "the Visitor module . . . automatically determines the language and country of a Web site visitor and directs the Web server to

deliver the appropriate localized content contained in one or more country/language databases and/or file-based content in a file system 204 to the visitor's browser").

Additionally, it would be inherent that a list of resources would be received on the network since a user would select a resource from the aforementioned list to request the resource in a certain browser state.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Lakritz relates to a translation management system in a computer environment. Lakritz automatically detects when a document, data stream, or non-text file in the master language has been updated and notifies the user which corresponding documents, data streams, or non-text files in the other languages require translation which are then staged and dynamically routed and sequenced to individual translation resources where the actual translation is performed. Management status, reporting, scheduling, and accounting information is sent to the user as the translation process ensues. The user is notified of the completion of translation and the invention coordinates the delivery of the translated documents, data streams, or non-text files back to the user's site for installation and optional review.

Lakritz provides an intuitive user interface for managing document content translation for multilingual Internet Web sites, documents, data streams, and non-text files, enabling the user to incrementally update the language content of a Web site or document and automatically initiate the translation of the content into the corresponding target languages, keeping the multilingual content synchronized and enhancing its maintainability and storage.

However, Lakritz's translation system completely fails to teach the claimed specifics relating to web crawling. Lakritz does not perform any type of crawling. Lakritz in fact is the target of a crawler, and as such it is a system that conventional web crawler cannot properly handle to the the multiple language states generated by Lakritz's translation system.

Lakritz does not show a method for crawling for resources in a network. Further, Lakritz fails to show receiving a list of resources on the network and for at least one of the resources on the list of resources, crawling by sending a first request to a server in the network for the resource using a first browser state, and sending a second request for the same resource using a second browser state.

Column 3, lines 61-67 of Lakritz relates to an automated Visitor module that customizes the visitor's views according to their language and country as follows:

The Visitor module greatly enhances the multilingual Web site visitor's experience by providing an automated and seamless way to serve content in the correct language. Web site publishers can serve all their multilingual content through a single point of entry using the Visitor module. Web site visitors will immediately understand the information they see when they enter a site because it will be instantly presented in their language and for their country.

With respect to FIG. 2, the Visitor module 202 works in tandem with a customer's existing Web server 203. It automatically determines the language and country of a Web site visitor and directs the Web server 203 to deliver the appropriate localized content contained in one or more country/language databases and/or file-based content in a file system 204 to the visitor's browser 201. Recently accessed localized content is placed into a Cache 206. The content is placed in the Cache 206 so that if a similar request comes in for a document in that language and for that country, then the cached version will be pushed out to the browser 201. This saves time and processor overhead for accessing the database and file system 204 to rebuild the requested content. In addition, Visitor 202 informs the browser 201 of the proper font and content encoding needed to display the selected language and enables the browser 201 to download the font using, for example, Bitstream's TrueDoc technology, if required.

The instant invention would work with Lakritz so that the content in Lakritz can be searched. This is done by iteratively crawling each state (or language version) that Lakritz presents to a visitor.

Since a Section 102 rejection requires that each and every element be present, and since Lakritz fails to teach crawling for resources in a network and fails to show receiving a list of resources on the network and for at least one of the resources on the list of resources, crawling by sending a first request to a server in the network for the resource using a first browser state, and sending a second request for the same resource using a second browser state, Lakritz cannot anticipate independent claims 1 and 21. Additionally, Lakritz cannot anticipate any claims dependent therefrom. Withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection is requested.

The Section 103 Rejection

Claims 6,8-9 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz, in view of Official Notice. The Office Action asserted that:

As per dependent claims 6 and 23, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a browser identification within the request for a resource so that the server may appropriately deliver the correct content according to the browser type (e.g. Internet Explorer, Netscape Navigator, or Mozilla Firefox) and/or the browser version (e.g. Internet Explorer v.5.1, or v.9.10.4.87).

As per dependent claim 8, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the first and second requests issued by two different crawler applications, both capable of having multiple browser states.

As per dependent claim 9, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the first and second requests issued by a crawler application that can vary its browser state between the first and second requests since a user would be able to change the browser settings between the first and second requests.

Applicant respectfully traverse these rejections. First, as discussed above, Lakritz is the target of the instant invention since it generates pages that are customized to the viewer's language and location. However, Lakritz completely fails to show crawling for resources in a network and fails to show receiving a list of resources on the network and for at least one of the resources on the list of resources, crawling by sending a first request to a server in the network for the resource using a first browser state, and sending a second request for the same resource using a second browser state.

The instant system can do things Lakritz cannot - i.e. the instant system can handle multiple DIFFERENT web sites and enables the effective indexing of DIFFERENT languages for THE SAME content across multiple sites. In contrast, Lakritz is for a single site. This is another difference that points away from the conclusion that the present invention unpatentable in view of Lakritz.

Lacking these elements, Lakritz cannot render obvious independent claims 1 and 21 as well as any claims dependent therefrom. Withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection is requested on this basis.

Further, the Office Action relied on Official Notice to fill-in important elements recited in each of claims 6, 8-9 and 23. Specific citations are requested, or the rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 6, 8-9 and 23 are patentable over Lakritz in view of Official Notice. Allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

If for any reason the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would in any way expedite prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (408) 528-7490.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bao Tran", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Bao Tran

Reg. No. 37,955